REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.   The Examiner rejected claims 16-19 and 53-56 under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite, indicating that it is not understood how the search menu can be created using the metadata attributes if the search has already been performed, and arguing that the search menu should be created prior to the user searching of the component.

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 53 to clarify the relationship between performing a search of the component database and dynamically creating the search menu using the metadata attributes. Specifically, the search menu includes information associated with the selected component. Therefore, a search is performed in order to obtain respective values for the metadata attributes associated with the selected component, and the search menu is dynamically created using the metadata attributes associated with the user-selected component as well as the respective values obtained for the metadata attributes from the component database. The search menu is not used to perform the search in which the respective values are obtained from the component database. Once created, however, the search menu can be employed by the user to search for a particular component, for example, by specifying a different part number. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the search menu should not be created prior to the claimed searching of the component database and that the claims are not indefinite.

2.   The Examiner rejected claims 16-19 and 53-56 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) and/or 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Danish.

Both the original claims and the amended claims require searching the component database using the metadata attributes associated with the selected component and dynamically creating a search menu using the metadata attributes. Applicants respectfully submit that Danish does not teach or otherwise suggest at least these claim elements. Specifically, Danish appears to use pre-defined screens (see, for example, column 10, line 44 through column 13, line 28 as well as Figures 11-20, which describe the use of datafiles that define the contents of each screen), and therefore Danish's screens are not dynamically created using metadata attributes associated with a selected component. Also, Danish does not appear to perform a search of a component database

using metadata attributes associated with the selected component prior to creating screens, as Danish's screens do not include specific values associated with a selected component (but rather include ranges of parameters for a family of components) and therefore such a search is not necessary.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that both the original claims and the amended claims are allowable over Danish.

3.   All pending claims are believed to be in a form suitable for allowance. Therefore, the application is believed to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully requests early allowance of the application. The Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned, Jeffrey T. Klayman, if it will assist further examination of this application.

4.   The applicants do not believe any extension of time is required for timely consideration of this response. In the event that an extension has been overlooked, this conditional petition of extension is hereby submitted, and Applicants request that deposit account number 19-4972 be charged for any fees that may be required for the timely consideration of this application.

Date: February 16, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey T. Klayman
Registration No. 39,250
Attorney for Applicants

Bromberg & Sunstein LLP
125 Summer Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02110-1618
Tel: (617) 443-9292
Fax: (617) 443-0004

02686/00113 467681.1